REMARKS / DISCUSSION OF ISSUES

Introductory Remarks

Claims 1-9 and 12-18 are pending in the application and presented for further consideration. Claims 1-2, 7-9, 12, and 15-18 have been amended to better define Applicants' contribution to the art and/or correct certain informalities therein. No new matter has been added.

Objections to the Claims

The objections to claims 7, 8 and 15-16 are moot in view of the amendments thereto.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph

The rejection of claim 15 under this section of the Code is also moot in view of the amendment thereto.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being unpatentable over *Ise, et al*. (US Patent Publication 20020028329). For at least the reasons set forth herein, these rejections are improper and should be withdrawn.

At the outset, Applicants note that in simplest form, the triplet and singlet states, recited in the claims, are the symmetric and antisymmetric eigenfunctions to the time independent Schroedinger equation, which can be derived from the expression of total energy. In classical mechanics, this expression is referred to the Hamiltonian. Often, this expression is carried over in quantum mechanical reference, with common understanding that the Schroedinger equation is more appropriate.

In rejecting claims 1 and 9, the Examiner relies on paragraphs [0010] and [0029] of *Ise, et al*. Ise's paragraph [0010], however, recites:

> *In the light emitting element of the present invention, for example, the above light emitting layer is held between a pair of electrodes and an electric field is applied to the electrodes whereby electrons are injected from a cathode and holes are injected from an anode. These electrons and holes are recombined with each other in the light emitting layer to create triplet excitons. When an exciton returns to the ground state, excess energy is emitted as light in the blue region. In the above light emitting element, the above light emitting layer is composed of a light emitting material (guest material) and a host material having a minimum excitation triplet energy level (T_1) higher than the T_1 of the light emitting material. This makes it possible to transfer the energy of the above triplet exciton to the T_1 level of the light emitting material efficiently, with the result that blue light can be emitted with high luminance efficiency.*

While the reference describes a light-emitting material, there is no disclosure of the matrix of a conductive organic material comprising a light-emitting material having a metallo-organic complex compound as specifically claimed. In the captioned paragraph above, the reference does describe a host material and a guest material, but does not describe a matrix as claimed. The term 'matrix' does not even appear in the reference.

In addition, as noted in the Applicants' specification, the light-emitting molecules of the triplet-emitter complex are beneficially hole-conductors, which facilitates the injection of holes into the anode of a device, and transportation of holes into the mixing layer. Claims 1 and 9 has been presently amended to specifically recite this feature.

For at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully submit that Ise fails to disclose at least one feature of each of independent claims 1 and 9. Claims 1 and 9 are thus patentable thereover. Moreover, claims 2-8 and 12-18, which depend from claims 1 and 9, respectively, are patentable for at least the same reasons and in view of their additionally recited subject matter.

Finally, in the Response to Arguments in the final Office Action, the Examiner directs Applicants to various secondary references in attempting to clarify his position. To the extent the Examiner's remarks remain germane, Applicants respectfully submit that reliance on more than a single reference in a rejection for anticipation is improper.

General Comments on Dependent Claims

Since each of rejected the dependent claims depends from a base claim that is considered to be in condition for allowance, as mentioned above, Applicants believe that it is unnecessary at this time to argue the allowability of each of the dependent claims individually. However, Applicants do not necessarily concur with the interpretation of the dependent claims as set forth in the Office Action, nor do Applicants concur that the basis for the rejection of any of the dependent claims is proper. Therefore, Applicants reserve the right to specifically address the patentability of the dependent claims in the future, if deemed necessary.

CONCLUSION

It is respectfully believed that all of the rejections, objections, or comments set forth in the Office action have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, objection, or comment set forth in the Office action does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, objection, or comment. In addition, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Furthermore, nothing in this paper should be construed as intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim.

In view of the foregoing remarks, this application should now be in condition for allowance. A notice to this effect is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes after this amendment that the application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the Applicants' representatives at the telephone number indicated below to discuss any outstanding issues relating to the allowability of the application.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 21-JUL -2008

Mark Beloborodov

Mark L. Beloborodov, Esq.
Reg. No. 50,773
(781) 418-9363

Please direct all correspondence to:

PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS
P.O. Box 3001
Briarcliff Manor, NY 10510-8001